

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing reasons that follow.

No claims are currently being amended or canceled.

New claim 19 has been added.

Claims 1-19 are pending in this application.

Applicant appreciates the indication in the Office Action that claims 5-8 and 11-14 contain allowable subject matter.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 2 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,815,252 to Price-Francis; and claims 3, 4, 9, 10 and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price-Francis in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,978,924 to Ahn. These rejections are traversed for at least the reasons given below.

In its rejection of claim 1, the Office Action asserts that Figures 3-5; column 2, line 59 – column 3, line 3, and column 4 lines 15-29 disclose the step of preserving user's individual information associated with the user regarding a device in every identified user at the time when the user suspends use of the device which the user uses. Applicant respectfully disagrees with this assertion. In the invention as recited in claim 1, a first user's individual information is preserved so that a second user can then use the same device that the first user had used, so that at a later time the first user can again use the device and return to the same place that he/she left off before the second user got to use the device.

In Price-Francis, on the contrary, it is directed to a system in which a single user's identification information is stored in an optical card, whereby the card owner's identity is verified using biometric information obtained from the card owner that is matched with owner identification information stored in the optical card. Figure 3 of Price-Francis shows an example of a physical representation of the user's fingerprint that may be printed on the front of the

user's card; Figure 4 of Price-Francis shows the instructions to place a randomly selected finger of the user; and Figure 5 of Price-Francis shows resulting information that can be downloaded to a scanning station when the user's identity has been verified. None of these figures of Price-Francis is directed to preserving a user's individual information associated with the user regarding a device in every identified user at the time when the user suspends use of the device which the user uses. In the present invention, when a user suspends the device, information corresponding to who that user is, as well as information corresponding to exactly what that user was doing (and thus where that user left off) is stored, whereby these features are not at all a part of the system and method of Price-Francis.

Column 2, line 59 to column 3, line 3 of Price-Francis is directed to storing a user's individual characteristics in an optical card, so that the user can be verified at a later time with those stored characteristics. Column 4, lines 15-29 of Price-Francis is directed to an identity card that stores various biometric information of an individual card owner.

None of these portions of Price-Francis is at all related to preserving a user's individual information regarding a device for every identified user at a time when the user suspends use of the device, whereby Price-Francis is merely directed to providing a scheme which verifies a card holder versus card owner information stored in an identity card.

Dependent claim 2 provides further details of the user's individual information, whereby it corresponds to any of work progressive information (e.g., the user finished scanning page 26 of a document just prior to suspending operation of a scanning device), work environmental information, and work historical information of the user who uses the device. As explained above, none of the above-cited portions of Price-Francis is directed to preserving such user's individual information. Rather, Price-Francis is directed to storing a user's identity information at a time when the user is being provided with an identity card, whereby that identity information is then used at a later time to verify

whether or not a card-holder in fact is the person who was previously issued the card. Clearly, this is not at all related to the present invention.

Ahn is used in the Office Action to disclose a suspension/resumption management means, and it does not rectify the above-mentioned shortcomings of Price-Francis.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 3 and 15 are patentable over the cited art of record. Dependent claims 2, 4-14 and 16-18 are patentable due to their dependencies on one of base claims 1, 3 and 15, as well as for the specific features recited in those dependent claims.

For example, with respect to claim 16, that claim recites that the user individual information includes work progressive information that provides information of how much the user accomplished with regards to completion of an operation. For example, if the user is scanning a book that has 100 pages and if the user suspends operation at page 80, then the stored user's individual information will include information that the user has completed 80% of his/her task. Column 7, lines 37-47 of Price-Francis (alleged in the Office Action as disclosing the features in claim 16) merely describes different types of biometric data or other user identification data that can be stored in an identity card in order to compare that stored data with real data obtained from a card holder, in order to determine that the card holder is the card owner. Figure 3 shows travel history information of the user, that may be extracted from his/her identity card, whereby that travel history information has nothing at all to do with information regarding how much a user accomplished a particular task that the user was performing with a device.

Accordingly, dependent claim 16 is patentable for this additional reason.

New claim 19 has been added to recite steps that are clearly not disclosed or suggested by the cited art of record, whereby these steps involve the use of a same device by two different users, and whereby the first user reuses the device at a stopping point corresponding to when he/she had first stopped using the device.

Therefore, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

July 1, 2004  
Date

Phillip J. Articola  
Phillip J. Articola  
Registration No. 38,819

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP  
Washington Harbour  
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20007-5143  
Telephone: (202) 672-5300  
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399